

DRAFT RECOVERY PLAN

FOR THE

NORTHERN SPOTTED OWL

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, the public information meeting was taken before LeAnne Law, Certified Shorthand Reporter, on Tuesday, May 22, 2007, beginning at the hour of 6:30 p.m., at the Douglas County Fairgrounds Conference Hall, 2110 S.W. Frear Street, in the City of Roseburg, County of Douglas, State of Oregon.

APPEARANCES

PRESIDING OFFICIAL:

Robert Ruesink, Retired US Fish and Wildlife Service

PANEL MEMBERS:

Dave Wesley, Deputy Regional Director US Fish and Wildlife Service Recovery Team Leader

Miel Corbett Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Assistant Project Leader

REPORTED BY:

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC Freelance Court Reporters

BY: LeANNE LAW, CSR

836 West Military Eugene: (541) 683-1314 Suite 210 Roseburg: (541) 673-6628 Roseburg, Oregon 97470 FAX: (541) 673-2180

ATTORNEY'S NOTES

PAGE	LINE	COMMENT
-		

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC (800) 237-DEPO (237-3376)

MR. RUESINK: Good evening. On behalf of the United States Fish & Wildlife Service, I welcome you to this public meeting on the Draft Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl. My name is Robert Ruesink. The last name is spelled R-u-e-s-i-n-k. I will be serving as the presiding official for this listening session.

My role is to conduct the session in order that we receive your comments accurately and for the record. I am not involved in any decision-making involving this issue.

Here with me at the front table also are representatives from the US Fish and Wildlife Service. To my immediate right is Dave Wesley. Dave is the deputy regional director of the Pacific Region and the team leader for the Northern Spotted Owl Recovery Team.

To Dave's right is Miel Corbett. Miel is the assistant project leader for the Oregon Fish & Wildlife office in Portland.

We do have a court reporter here this evening to make sure that we get an accurate record of comments and statements that you make to us on this draft recovery plan.

Next to the meeting room over to my left is an information room. Some of you may have been over

there already. It's where we do have a lot of written and display materials to provide information about the draft recovery plan for the NSO.

We also have staff from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, from the Forest Service, and from the Bureau of Land Management in that room to help answer any questions you might have.

At this point I'd like to introduce Dave Wesley, who will give a presentation on the draft recovery plan. Dave.

MR. WESLEY: Thank you, Bob. Can everybody hear me? I think I'm going to walk down here and actually do this from the front. I'm going to take just a few minutes and walk through what we did with the recovery plan and what you can expect.

Some of you may not have had an opportunity to read the recovery plan or perhaps you've read various things about the recovery plan, so I thought I'd take just a few minutes and walk through what we spent the last year working on and give you an overview before we receive your comments.

Just for some background information, the norther spotted owl (NSO) was listed in 1990 as a threatened species. This follows on after the Interagency Scientific Committee talked about that in a

report that was dated in 1990 as well.

In 1992 the Fish and Wildlife Service provided critical habitat for the NSO, and in 1992 there was also a draft recovery plan that was prepared by another recovery team. That draft was never made final. It was completed in the second form in December of 1992 but was never made final.

And in 1994 the administration at that time came out with the Northwest Forest Plan, which was deemed to be the federal contribution for the recovery of the spotted owl, a further reason why we don't have it done.

And between that and 2004 a lot of research was done on the NSO. A lot of information was provided to scientists and a lot of different research was done.

And as far as our ongoing responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act, we're required to conduct a review of the species every five years.

There was a review done in 2004 under contract to a private consulting firm, and they completed that five-year review in 2004. That basically serves as an excellent document to summarize all of the information about owls.

So when we started our plan, we were fortunate that we had many of the documents to refer to

as well as the 2004 five-year review, which, like I said, did an excellent job of summarizing all the information to that point.

What is in the recovery plan? The recovery plan is basically a road map to allow folks to look at what is necessary to take the species off the list.

First of all, there's a strategy. What is necessary? What do you want to do? How do you get there? What is the strategy? What are some objectives? How do we go about developing the specific objectives?

You have to have some measurable criteria.

What is it that you're going to be able to look for? We really worked hard on the measurable part of it.

Looking at the plan, there's some very detailed descriptions about those criteria and what they are.

It's very important that they be measurable, we all agree on what it is we're looking for and how we measure that.

There's also specific recovery actions that are necessary that are outlined in the recovery plan.

And I want to remind everybody the recovery plan is advisory only. It does not have any force of law. It's not a regulation. It's an advisory document and it doesn't contain any regulatory authorities. So there's nothing that we can make people do as a result

of the recovery plan.

So how do we go about doing that? We started this process in April of 2006. The plan was developed initially and completed by December of 2006. We sent it to Washington. There was some review. They asked us to look at other options under the plan, and some additions were done, and those revisions were completed, and the plan was published in April of 2007.

There's currently a 60-day comment period that we're asking for folks to be able to provide comments on. That ends right now on the 25th of June, I believe, but we are likely that we're going to be extending that. We received a request for extension, several of those. I don't have an official date yet when it will be, but it will probably be extended.

If you know what comments you'd like to make and you already have your comments, I encourage you to go ahead and get them in early, but there is a possibility that we are going to extend it for another 60 days.

We also committed to having a public meeting. There's no requirement for us to do that, but we felt that this was a subject of interest and of such import for the public that we would do a public meeting in each state.

In fact, we're going to do two in Oregon.

This one is the first one. We're doing tomorrow night in Redding, California, and we're doing one next week in Portland and then also next week in Lacey, a suburb of Tacoma. But we will be doing four public meetings.

And our goal is to have the final plan completed in the public and Federal Register by April of 2008.

So how did we get to there? We had a recovery team that was providing advice to the service as it developed it.

And I want to, again, advise folks that this is a service document. All of the recovery team members may not agree with all the information that's in there. We work for a consensus and we try to get there, but they may not all agree with all the stuff that is there. So it is a service document that is advised by the recovery team.

We did have 12 members on the recovery team. We tried to get initially and throughout the process as good a representation as we could. We had five federal land management agencies that were involved: Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Park Service, the Fish and -- start again -- Fish and Wildlife Service, The Bureau of Land Management, the

Forest Service, the BIA, and I'm missing one.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Park service.

MR. WESLEY: Park Service. Thank you very much. The Park Service.

And so the three -- besides several agencies we had the three states involved, a representative from Washington, Oregon, and California; and we had folks from the timber industry, two folks from the timber industry; and we had two folks from environmental organizations.

So we did have 12 members of the team.

Several of those members are here tonight, and they'll be -- in fact, I'll go ahead and recognize them now.

John Siperek.

John, will you raise your hand.

John is with California. He was our big
California representative. Lowell Diller, is one of the
industry representatives. Ed Murphy is another one of
the industry representatives. Mike Cafferata is from
the State of Oregon, and Lenny Young is from the State
of Washington, and Mike Haske over here from the Bureau
of Land Management.

So those are some of the members of the team, and they're here to be able to interact with you later on in the program.

And I did mention the two conservation folks. I forgot to mention those. Again, there were some from the conservation community, one from the National Center for Conservation Science and Policy and one from the National Audubon Society. So we think we did have a good representation of where we were.

The team was very active. We met either in person or via conference call almost 30 times within the ESA. We did look at and heavily rely on information that we got from science. We conducted three different types of panels where we had 50 scientists or managers that are actively involved in spotted owl work or spotted owl management to get them to inform us about some of the science that they were working on from the management action and to help us identify the threats, some of the actions and criteria that we would be able to develop to do that.

We built from existing frameworks including the draft recovery plan and the Northwest Forest Plan. What kept coming up over and over again was the information that the structure in the original plan was probably a pretty good one and we should look at staying at that kind of information after.

Some of the portions of the document are already peer reviewed, and I'll talk about peer review

in a minute, but we wanted to make sure that the biology was right, so the whole biology section of the plan has been peer reviewed, and we feel it's a good representation of the biology in the plan.

So what are the recovery objectives? It's the kind of thing you would see in most recovery plans. I've been in this business for almost 34 years, and it's not too dissimilar from a lot of the recovery plans that we see.

A lot of them talk about populations. There are large contingencies of them. They occur throughout the historic range.

The next one that -- obviously if you've got populations, then you need the habitat to support them, and you also have to have the habitat spread throughout the range.

And the third one is you have to deal with the threats. One of those threats hanging over the population or the habitat is how do you mitigate or manage for those kinds of threats? How do you eliminate those threats so that the species is likely to be able to stay recovered? First of all, you've got to recover, then stay recovered.

One of the things that we learned early on is there is a threat from the barred owl that has not

been discussed or noticed in a lot of the previous literature that was done, so it's a relatively new threat.

There's a concern about the barred owl coming in and competing with the spotted owl and actually displacing it from its area.

Also habitat loss and modification is also a key factor. When we listed the owl, it was loss of habitat and regulatory mechanisms. Well, we think we have some very good mechanisms in place. The owl has been listed, but we don't want to lose sight of the fact that we continue to protect and monitor the habitat.

The barred owl has perhaps got a fair amount of press is how do you deal with the barred owl. And one of the things that we talked about doing was forming the barred owl working group. That's one of the first recommendations in the plan so that we could have a group of scientists and managers that work together to look at that threat and give us some guidance on how to proceed forward dealing with that. They want to be able to conduct research so that we can better understand the threat.

And then once we understand that to proceed with some kind of experimental removal to see if in fact there is a relationship between removing barred owls and

some response -- positive response by the spotted owl.

How do we do that? Where do we do that?

How large a scale do we do it? How often do we have to do that? There's a lot of questions that we need to look at before we proceed on any kind of a large-scale project of that nature.

When you get to habitat, the plan is a little different than any other plan that we've done before in that it talks about two different kinds of options. There are two options in the plan that describe how you would protect habitat.

Option 1 is pretty much the standard that you've seen before. It models on a lot of stuff that was done in some of that earlier work where you have distinct areas that are outlined on a map. They are specific reserves that are clearly identified and they are reserves that are set aside. There are specific areas where -- actually that are targeted.

These areas are called managed owl conservation areas, lovingly called MOCAs. So we have another new vernacular for you in the agency. If you're familiar with the owl, then you're familiar with DCAs, designated conservation area, or the HCAs, habitat conservation areas. Our moniker is MOCAs, managed owl conservation areas.

MOCAs in the plan total about 7.7 million acres. The maps are there, and if you go into the room next door, you can look at some of those maps. You'll see that they're about 7.7 acres -- 7.7 million acres.

Option 2 also relies on habitat blocks, because, like I said earlier, the science points us back to the fact that habitat blocks in large areas of reserved land set aside for protection is really critical to make sure that the owls are protected.

But it doesn't rely upon necessarily specifically prescribed areas on a map. What it does is provides a set of rules to guide land managers on how they designate those.

We went back to the science that was used to establish Option 1 where they talk about the number of pairs of owls that are along with the pair, how far apart they need to be, and if you have groups of owls that are smaller than that. The initial pair was 20 pair and now there's only 19. What is the distance that they need to be apart and some other parameters we used to develop the rule set. And then we apply that rule set and try to make it work on the ground.

So rather than just provide the public with a set of rules and try to figure out how that will actually look, what we did is we, as a group, sat down

and said okay, how would we take that set of rules and apply it on the ground? What is an example of that so far?

So what you see in Option 2 is essentially -- is essentially an example. It's not necessarily what Option 2 would look like. It's an example of what it could be. It's an example of what the team came up with.

And the example that we have there -- and one thing I should mention is it could be more or less than Option 1 depending upon how you put the -- put the controlled areas on the ground or the reserves on the ground. You could actually have more or possibly even less.

But the example that we used in the recovery plan has about just under 7 million acres in it. So you'll see there is about a 700,000-acre difference, but it's based on the same science, based on the same underlying data.

In both options it's important to recognize that the habitat blocks, or the MOCAs, were established in 10 of the 12 provinces. The owl was mapped in physiographic provinces. There's 10 of them that are described physiographically. I think maybe you're familiar with those.

1

2

3

4

5

6

of the LSRs.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

10-year period of time. That needs to be

What we're looking to do is manage for a

There were two areas where we didn't feel

In both cases they include less land than

And the MOCAs contain only federal land and

One of the criteria for listing how will we

that there was a value of doing that. Both of those are

the Northwest Forest Plan LSR, so it doesn't include all

exclude virtually all of the private forest. One of the

private land. We tried to base this on federal land and

know when we get there, one of the things is you need to

very, very difficult to get an absolute number or try to

have a stable or increasing population trend. One of

the questions we're asked a lot is, "What is the

number?" You know, how many owls do we need?

things we did in Option 1 was tried to exclude all

tried to make this subsequent recovery work just on

federal land if we possibly could.

excluded in both options, Option 1 and Option 2.

well-distributed, that population, throughout the range

population trend, a stable or increasing trend over a

of the owl.

manage a number.

If there's sufficient habitat in the

conservation areas, be they MOCAs, managed owl conservation, or habitat reserves established under Option 2.

If the threats, the barred owl specifically, are managed.

And the fifth one is that there is a monitoring plan established. The ESA requires that in the recovery plan that one of the things that we have to have is time before we delist anything would be to have a plan in place that we could monitor to make sure that it happens so we don't have to put the species back on the list.

It's important to recognize that there are recovery actions. There's 37 specific actions that are outlined in the plan. Those actions are explained in both Option 1 and Option 2, and there's basically four categories of those actions.

The first one is management actions. What kind of things can we do on the land, how would you manage for prey species, how would you manage for a particular aspect of a forest manager or certain horticultural practices. Those are management actions.

The second one is research actions. What kinds of research do we need to do? Research on barred owl, research on fire, dealing with some of the impact

on fire, and those kinds of things.

Third one would be regulatory actions. Are there actions that we can do to ease the regulatory process to perhaps streamline how habitat conservation plans are done or how federal agencies control one another are regulatory actions.

And the fourth one is monitoring actions.

Again, you need to monitor the population. We need to monitor habitat.

So how do we know that it's recovered and how much do we think this is all going to cost? Well, if all the actions are implemented successfully, we estimate that we can do that in as few as 30 years and for approximately \$200 million.

One of the things that we also committed to do as we went through it, because we want this plan to be based on the science, is to insure that the science that we used is correctly used and correctly applied and committed to doing peer review as we were developing the plan.

We plan to use two different processes. The first one is we contracted with two professional societies to ask them to go to their members and to do an evaluation of the plan. We're using the American Ornithologists Union, AOU, and the Society for

Conservation Biology. Those are the two professional organizations. We have asked for two reviews from each of those, so we'll get four reviews from that.

We've also used a fair amount of science from many of the owl researchers. So what we did is we had a direct questionnaire. We sent a direct questionnaire to scientists whose data we used and asked them specifically about did we interpret the science correctly and other questions they may have with regard to that.

So it's important to us that we get the review and we get the information and the feedback on that.

So what are the next steps? We did publish the draft in April. Like I said, we're doing these four public meetings. We're going to have peer review. Hopefully the peer review will come in during the comment period. We have every intention and hope that they will be delivering for us on peer review. And our goal, again, is to finalize this plan by April of 2008.

So who to contact? We're here to hear from you tonight. There are comment cards. There's an opportunity for comments in the other room as well.

There are stations for -- if you're interested you can walk around and see some of the maps and some of the

displays that we have in there. We're anxious to get those.

We'll take your calls. Paul or -- basically we prefer that you send them to us in writing, and there's the contact information there. We also have an owl website that you can get to and get some information from that.

So that's a quick overview of sort of what we did and how we got to being here tonight, and we're anxious now to hear from you on what your thoughts are.

We would like to make sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as the other members of the recovery team, have an opportunity to hear what you have to say.

Bob?

MR. RUESINK: Thank you, Dave. Notice of this public meeting was published in the Federal Register on April 26, 2007, beginning on page 20865.

As Dave mentioned, currently the public comment period on the draft recovery plan ends at the close of business on Monday, June 25, 2007. All comments must be received by that time.

After review and consideration of your comments and all other information gathered during this comment period, the Fish and Wildlife Service will

publish a final recovery plan.

Purposes of this session are twofold: One, to provide information on the draft recovery plan and, two, to receive your comments. Comments on all aspects of the draft plan are very important and will be carefully considered.

Because of your -- of the importance of your comments, it is necessary that we follow certain procedures here this evening.

If you wish to make oral comments at the session, please register at the sign-in table outside the room. Fill out the slip and you'll get a card that I'll call when we're ready for you to give your comments.

When you register, indicate if you are representing any agency or organization with your comments.

When you're called to present your comments, please come forward to one of the two microphones in the front. Begin your presentation by stating your full name, spell it, and indicate again if you are representing an agency or an organization.

If you're reading comments, I would ask that you take care to read them slowly enough for the court reporter to understand and get an accurate transcript of

them for the record.

1.5

Also, if you do have a copy of your comments that you could leave with the reporter, that again insures that we have an accurate record of what you have to say.

You will not be questioned in connection with any of the comments you make. Your comments are being recorded and are being preserved for the administrative record.

Because the purpose of the session is to receive the comments, we presume that any questions that you might raise are for the record.

The Fish and Wildlife Service's formal response to questions and issues raised during the comment period, including here this evening, will be published in the final notice for the recovery plan.

We will not respond to questions posed during your statement.

Given that the other purpose of this session is to provide information on the draft recovery plan for the NSO, again, I would call your attention to the information room just to the left of this one where we do have several displays and a lot of information that you may find helpful.

While we're taking comments here, we've

closed off the partition, but you can still access that room through the hallway and then back in there to where the displays and some of the staff are located.

Feel free to go back and forth between the rooms. I would only ask that when you come back into this room that you be considerate of the speakers and of the reporter when you come back in.

Again, a reminder that the reporter will not record any statements that are from the audience or that are made to the audience. She will only be recording comments that are made directly into the microphones facing the front of the room.

Instead of presenting oral comments, you may submit comments in writing or you may supplement any comments that you make here this evening with written comments. They may be submitted to the staff at the registration table or they may — they may be mailed to the following address, which I'll give you in just a minute. It's available at the registration and the information tables, and that address is US Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services, 911 Northeast 11th Avenue, and that's in Portland, Oregon 97232.

You may also submit comments by fax, by courier, by e-mail, or over the Internet. And details on the methods for submitting comments in those ways are

available on a little card that, again, is at the sign-in desk or in the information room.

Written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments that are presented here this evening.

We do have a number of speakers that have indicated they wish to present comments, and so I would ask that you try to limit your statement and your comments to approximately three minutes so that we have ample time to give everyone an opportunity to speak who wishes to do so.

At this point we are ready for our first speaker.

Susan Applegate, would you come to one of the microphones, please. State your name for the record and indicate if you're representing anyone with your comments.

MS. APPLEGATE: Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Susan, S-u-s-a-n, Applegate, A-p-p-l-e-g-a-t-e, just like it sounds. I'm speaking as an individual, but I am a board member of Oregon Wild as an organization. That's a conservation organization whose headquarters are in Portland.

I'm also a member of Umpqua Watersheds, and a person who grew up here in the Northwest and loves

this -- the legacy of our native wild forests, the home of the spotted owl.

I want to begin by saying that I was interested to hear that there's going to be scientific peer review. On the news there has been disturbing references to Bush appointees manipulating scientific data in order to have a certain outcome in recovery plans.

And the Bush oversight committee -- this one claims new studies show that too much old-growth forest around a nest is bad for owl fitness. This is based on a very small study with limited data where the scientists who conducted this study warn, and I will quote this, "We do not recommend that forest managers use our modeling results as a prescription for managing habitat until other similar studies have been conducted."

I know there is enormous political pressure on the scientists who are doing work for government agencies that have repercussions in our natural resources our public lands.

I know there's enormous pressure and -- I hope that's not for me. And so I have -- I'm very skeptical. I'm very, very alert to the unbiased and excellent science that must accompany this recovery

plan.

The owl -- spotted owl has been in decline, and that's a well-known fact. It has not had any period of time where it has been advancing in population, and so I'm rather -- I'm quite disappointed that this recovery plan reduces the number of acres, the amount of land set aside, old growth, that unique ecosystem that the owl and a myriad of other flora and fauna require for their existence, that that -- that this plan actually reduces that number.

It also breaches some of the promises that we had with the Northwest Forest Plan, and the Northwest Forest Plan has had a very rocky road. I don't know that it has ever had a single year where it has been fully and faithfully followed.

MR. RUESINK: Ms. Applegate, that was our three-minute buzzer so --

MS. APPLEGATE: Darn it.

MR. RUESINK: -- I will ask you to try to wrap up here in the next minute or so.

MS. APPLEGATE: Okay. I've taken my time, but I will say that I'm upset about post logging -- post fire logging in owl habitat.

I cannot tell you how disturbing it is in the wilderness or old-growth areas that the logging in

those areas post fire introduces so many invasive 1 species, and it's absolutely contrary to what those owls 2 3 need. And with that I guess I will close. Ι 4 5 didn't make my points, but I will write you, and I want to thank you for this opportunity to make my comments 6 7 public. Thank you. 8 MR. RUESINK: Thank you. And you can submit 9 those additional comments in writing. 10 MS. APPLEGATE: Thank you. 11 MR. RUESINK: Our next speaker is Francis 12 Eatherington. Would you come to the microphone, please. 13 MS. EATHERINGTON: Hello. My name is 14 Frances Eatherington. That's F-r-a-n-c-i-s 15 E-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-q-t-o-n, and I work with Umpqua 16 Watersheds here in Roseburg, Oregon. 17 And I encourage you to consider all these 18 comments you hear today, and I believe that both options 19 that you subscribed up there this evening are inadequate 20 because both options reduce the current protected 21 habitat. According to Dominick DellaSala, a recovery 22 team member, Option 1 would reduce the Northwest Forest 23 Plan protected areas by 27 percent, and Option 2 by an

The draft recovery plan itself fails to

additional 820,000 acres.

24

25

document how much protected habitat would be lost under each option in relation to the acres protected now in late successional reserves.

Since the spotted owl population is currently declining, the recovery plan should improve on the Northwest Forest Plan. Instead it appears the recovery plan is a map of how the forest plan can be further weakened.

The Northwest Forest Plan is already not protective enough because thousands of acres of spotted owl habitat in old-growth forests can continue to be logged in the matrix.

The recovery plan should have instead strengthened the weak points of the Northwest Forest Plan. For instance, new spotted owl nests discovered in the matrix have been given a zero-foot logging buffer while barred owl nest sites are given a five-acre logging buffer.

The Roseburg BLM has justified protecting the barred owl nest sites but not protecting the spotted owl nest sites by stating that a viable owl population in matrix lands are not essential for the conservation of the species.

Just to wrap up here, I would like to say that protecting all remaining spotted owl habitat in the

public forests will still allow sufficient logging to continue, delivering a predictable supply of logs to local mills and providing our community with forest-related jobs by thinning in our overstocked, fire-prone managed plantations.

Thinning our backlog of 50-year-old tree plantations should be done before any more old growth is converted to new tree farms. This would give the service time to study the owl situation, as suggested in the draft plan, and give more options in the future for protecting the spotted owl threatened with extinction.

Thank you.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you for your comments. I know that the three minutes goes by pretty quickly, and so if you can summarize your comments and then submit a longer version in writing, I think that would be very helpful. Thank you.

Our next speaker is Pat Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Joseph Patrick Quinn, Q-u-i-n-n, Camas Valley. Represent myself. I'm also a proud member of Umpqua Watersheds, and I would like to preface my remarks by thanking you for coming to Roseburg.

Two, I have not read the plan yet, so my book reviewer -- not a book he hasn't read, and I'll give my other comments later.

Three, I would like to second Mrs.

Applegate's incredulity or skepticism about the almost axiomatic political pressure placed by the current administration on scientific inquiries across the board.

I would also -- I've heard it mentioned that one of the options throws the decision into the hands of local, for example, BLM district managers.

I have lived for nearly 30 years next to a piece of Coos Bay Wagon Road land that was heavily clear-cut -- excuse me, regenerated in the early '70s. They have not been back to do a damn thing except to lay out the next clear-cut of the remaining old growth that was stopped by the spotted owl in 1989.

Their own management document says they have approximately 800,000 acres of totally unmanaged land in western Oregon in immediate need of commercial and precommercial thinning of which they accomplish approximately a little over 1 percent a year. That's a 70- to 80-year backlog in maintenance they are either unable are unwilling to conduct.

I would not trust them to enforce protections for the spotted owl or any -- or the wood rat for that matter. No offense, nothing personal meant.

Also, as we know, the spotted owl is

well-known as a canary in a coal mine. We understand 1 that metaphor. I would submit at least in part the 2 barred owl is a red herring. 3 Thank you. 4 Thank you, Mr. Quinn. 5 MR. RUESINK: 6 Doug Robertson, you're our next speaker. Good evening. My name is 7 MR. ROBERTSON: I'm a chairman of the Douglas County 8 Doug Robertson. 9 Board of Commissioners and also president of the 10 Association of O&C Counties and glad to be with you this 11 I have a statement to read and a couple of 12 comments if that's permissible. 13 14 15

The Oregon California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Lands Act of 1937 provides the statutory authority for the BLM to manage the O&C and Coos Bay Wagon Road timberlands in Oregon.

Section 701b of the Federal Land Planning Management Act states that in case of conflict of the O&C Act, the O&C Act will prevail as it relates to the management of timber resources.

The O&C Act requires a permanent source of timber supply that shall be sold, cut, and removed from approximately 2.2 million acres of O&C land and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands on a sustained-yield basis.

The act's language is legislative history

25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and the courts conclude that the dominant use is timber production for these lands.

Fifty percent of total receipts obtained from the sale of timber and other forest products are paid and distributed to the 18 O&C counties on an annual basis. This revenue forms an essential part of county budgets helping to pay for health and social services, libraries, law enforcement, and many other public services.

The BLM must manage the O&C and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands in compliance with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, NEPA, and other applicable Acts.

The BLM is currently revising six western
Oregon land use plans, as you know. New plans must
answer the question regarding how the BLM should manage
the O&C statutory requirements of permanent timber
production on a sustained-yield basis while complying
with the Endangered Species Act.

The spotted owl recovery plan must answer the same questions: How can the recovery plan achieve protection and recovery for the spotted owl while allowing for permanent timber production on a sustained-yield basis on the O&C and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands in western Oregon?

Option 2 provides the greatest opportunity for allowing BLM to meet its statutory regulatory requirements associated with the O&C Act and the Endangered Species Act.

Adopting Option 2 would allow BLM to develop resource management plans that would allow for, number one, the conservation and recovery of the spotted owl, and number two, permanent production of timber on a sustained-yield basis, and number three, significant revenues to counties to pay for essential public services.

Option 2 is the best option because it incorporates the most up-to-date scientific knowledge and allows the land management agencies to place the spotted owl protection areas where they will do the most good for the owl.

While the draft recovery plan options incorporate the latest scientific knowledge about the NSO, it retains the longstanding habitat network established almost 20 years ago.

The only difference in the two options is that Option 2 allows the federal land managers to identify the habitat blocks based on up-to-date, site-specific habitat analysis and better-known owl locations, whereas Option 1 slightly modifies a network

originally designed in 1992 based on limited owl location information, generalized large-scale maps of the region, and a less well developed understanding of owl habitat needs.

The recovery plan needs to elaborate more on how the barred owl populations are going to be reduced. What is missing in the recovery plan is the lack of a contingency plan if the federal agencies are not able to control the barred owl population.

And let me just share with you in closing, as perhaps others have, I had many people approach me with a question after reading or listening to some of the options being considered by Fish and Wildlife about shooting barred owls.

And the response I've had, although I realize that it's only a suggestion that is being considered, has been, "This isn't right, is it?" or that "They're certainly not really considering doing that, are they?" And of course they are.

And the comments that resonated in a variety of ways, number one, two species so closely connected with one another that they interbreed, making a decision to shoot one in hopes of protecting the other seems to be a very questionable way to proceed.

And obviously the next step, and very easily

connecting the dots, are the harbor seals, the Stellar 1 2 sea lions, the birds, the gulls, and the cormorants that are decimating the population of protected salmon. 3 So I would urge that we look at that option 4 5 very carefully. Thank you. 6 MR. RUESINK: Thank you, Mr. Robertson. Do you by chance have a copy of your comments that you 7 could leave with us? 8 9 MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah, I do. MR. RUESINK: I think that would be very 10 11 helpful for the reporter. Be happy to do that. 12 MR. ROBERTSON: THE COURT: Our next speaker is Seth Kirby. 13 14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Seth Kirby, 15 S-e-t-h K-i-r-b-y. I work for Umpqua Watersheds. I would like to thank you for involving the 16 17 public in this process and allowing comments to be 18 heard. I will also be submitting comments in writing 19 through the mail. 20 The recovery plan which has been proposed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service does not 21 22 properly insure protection for the NSO. Both of the 23 options are flawed and a better solution needs to be 24 found.

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC 1-800-237-DEPO

This plan is not entirely based on science

25

and is being used as a political tool to allow more logging in old-growth forests.

will not contribute to the goal of the greater owl population. We need the forests protected at the highest level to insure old-growth habitat remains for the owl to survive and eventually thrive. We cannot remap areas and expect a healthier habitat and improved results.

Option 2 allows too much potential logging of old-growth habitat. It is not based on science and appears to simply be a political tool to allow more logging on old-growth forests.

The ability to simply eliminate and/or relocate habitat blocks is absurd and illogical. A new option should be begun which is based on science and not political influence.

It is good to see that this plan will be peer viewed, and I hope that that is extended to the next draft. The next draft should include more old-growth habitat, not the ability to reduce it. Our public lands should be thinned before any more old growth is cut.

I want my children to grow up in the Northwest with the ability to experience all that the

1 natural lands have to offer. It is important for their survival and well-being to hike in old-growth forests, 2 drink clean water, and witness wild creatures. 3 The forests are sacred places to my family 4 5 and many other people, and I want them to be protected 6 as strongly as possible. 7 I look forward to an improved plan that will 8 help the spotted owl recover and protect our old-growth 9 forests. 10 Thank you. 11 MR. RUESINK: Thank you, Mr. Kirby. 12 Our next speaker is Bob Hoehne. 13 MR. HOEHNE: Thank you. I appreciate this 14 opportunity to give you comment. That's Hoehne, 15 H-o-e-h-n-e. 16 And I just kind of came back into town and 17 so I don't have a whole lot of real smooth notes here 18 like my comrades here. I wish I did. 19 But I would like to say that, like a lot of 20 people across the whole United States, the Endangered 21 Species Act we really look to it to save our fellow 22 species, whether they be fish or birds. A lot of people 23 consider it the Noah's Ark.

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC 1-800-237-DEPO

these years for you to be coming to us with this plan

And I think at this point in time after all

24

25

that gives two options that decreases the habitat for the owl as a chance for survival is shameful actually.

At this point in time we count on you, the Fish and Wildlife Service, to look after our fellow animals, which have a lot to do with clean water the rest of the habitat and the rest of the plants and the animals depend upon.

So I'm disappointed that at this point you come to us with a plan that takes away habitat from the spotted owl.

I've lived across from a timber sale -- I've lived with the spotted owls for about 20 years. As soon as they clear-cut -- Roseburg Lumber clear-cut, I couldn't hear the owls for about five or six years, and I can testify -- I'm no scientist, but I've seen the dirt and mud come down the creek for about five or six years after. It's starting to recuperate now.

So I would suggest that you take all the possible action you can to protect our fellow species, not just the spotted owl but the salmon that depend on the fresh water also.

And I encourage you to do that, and I also expect you to do it.

Thank you.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you, Mr. Hoehne.

Shannon Applegate, you're our next speaker.

MS. APPLEGATE: My name is Shannon

Applegate. That's S-h-a-n-n-o-n, Applegate,

A-p-p-l-e-g-a-t-e. I'm here as an individual and as a historian.

I have been involved in this community as an observer and as someone involved in such things as the 318 Committee on Bureau of Land Management. I served as chair of that in the 1990s. And I look at this event today and hear you say that this is a plan that will take -- stand 30 years and cost approximately \$200 million.

And I think of the differences in the decade that's just passed and what we know in the present about climate change and many other factors that weren't even part of our thinking, in fact were ridiculed in the 1990s.

And so many of the meetings were in rooms like this in this community. And so I am simply putting in a cautionary word from a historian's perspective.

It is -- with the forest, as well as with other things, this idea of short-term gain to somehow bandage things together to try to make peace with our social and economic interests and our environmental interests is going to cause a lot of long-term pain.

And I think that we've had a chance to see 1 that already, and so I'm here as a historian tonight 2 making my notes that I will compare with the ones that I 3 made in the 1990s, and I wonder what we're learning. 4 5 Thank you. MR. RUESINK: Thank you. 6 Deborah Michel, you're next. 7 MS. MICHEL: My name is Deborah Michel, 8 9 D-e-b-o-r-a-h M-i-c-h-e-l. And I'm like Bob. I don't have a real 10 11 scientific thing. I just have a real simple point. 12 I've been working with the Northwest Forest Plan for a 13 while making comments on timber sales, and I felt like 14 the Northwest Forest Plan was not strong enough. 15 NSOs are still declining. 16 So when I heard there was a new plan, I 17 thought, wow, somebody really cares. They're going to 18 put some teeth in this and make it stronger. And in 19 fact that's not the case. Both these options reduce the 20 habitat for the NSO. 21 So to me it just looks like another attempt 22 to get more trees out of these forests that really is 23 sustainable. That's all.

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC 1-800-237-DEPO

Ross Mickey, you're the next speaker.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you.

24

25

MR. MICKEY: Thank you for this opportunity.

My name is Ross Mickey, M-i-c-k-e-y. I'm with the

American Forest Resource Council.

The American Forest Resource Council represents primary wood manufacturers in the West and the tens of thousands of employees who live and play in their rural communities.

AFRC is very concerned about the well-being of all our wildlife species. Over the last 20 years we have spent millions of dollars supporting basic wildlife research to bats to salamanders to owls and, yes, the northern spotted owl. One of these includes the longest running spotted owl demographic study areas, which is located in Washington state.

AFRC supports the adoption of Option 2 of the draft recovery plan for the NSO. We support this alternative because it uses the most up-to-date scientific information while maintaining the historic habitat network system proposed by the Interagency Scientific Committee in the early 1990s.

The procedure by which this habitat network is implemented in Option 2 is far superior to that used in Option 1 in many ways.

Option 2 let's the spotted owl define the most optimum habitat to be included in the network.

Option 1 relies on antiquated habitat definitions to slightly modify the network developed 15 years ago using habitat maps drawn by over 100 different people. These maps were so crude that they didn't even match up between the different administrative units.

Option 2, on the other hand, let's the spotted owl tell us what habitat they use. A novel idea. Why rely on man-made definitions based more on political than real science when we can use a definition based on what the spotted owl actually deserves?

The rule set that will be used to define the habitat network for the spotted owl in Option 2 is still ultraconservative as it assumes that no spotted owls will migrate between the large habitat blocks while at the same time calls for the establishment of dispersal habitat between them to insure that this actual migration will occur.

Also, the size of each habitat block is 25 percent larger than what is needed to support a self-sustaining population within each individual habitat block without any immigration from outside that block.

Each self-sustaining block is then placed very close to another self-sustaining block to insure that owls will in fact migrate between them.

Option 2 then expands this redundant system from northern California to the Canadian border, establishing a fail-safe system capable of healing any break in the system caused by natural catastrophic events such as wildfires and windstorms.

The system is designed to meet any physical loss of habitat -- suitable habitat but not suitable habitat loss due to invasion by competing species such as the barred owl.

Without aggressive control of the barred owl population, the extensive multimillion-acre habitat system will be wasted. Millions of acres of physically suitable habitat are currently void of spotted owls while the larger, more aggressive barred owl thrives there.

The barred owl has established itself throughout the spotted owl range, growing in size every day. The barred owl is not only decimating the spotted owl population but all of our native owl species.

Some are claiming that the answer is additional habitat protection. They say that what we need is more habitat, not less. I fail to see how providing more habitat for the barred owl is going to help the spotted owl survive.

How will increasing the size of the barred

1 owl population by providing it more habitat help to 2 increase the size of the spotted owl population? Look at it this way: If a neighborhood of, 3 say, 1,000 homes became uninhabitable due to a massive 4 invasion of rabid mice, would the solution be to build 5 1,000 more homes? Obviously not. You would first 6 7 eliminate the mice so the homes were habitable again. 8 In the case of the spotted owl, we first have to make the millions of acres of the habitat we 9 10 currently have dedicated to the owl habitable again by 11 eliminating the barred owl. 12 If we find it infeasible either physically, 13 economically, or socially to control the barred owl, 14 then we need to think of a contingency plan to make sure 15 that the spotted owl will not go extinct. I have more comments, but I will submit 16 17 those in writing. Thank you very much. 18 MR. RUESINK: Thank you, Mr. Mickey. Do you 19 have a copy for the reporter? Thank you. 20 Mary Moffat, you are our next speaker. 21 My name is Mary Moffat, MS. MOFFAT: 22 M-o-f-f-a-t, and I'm a landowner in the coast range and member of the Siuslaw Watershed Council. 23 24 Having lived in a few other countries before

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC 1-800-237-DEPO

I moved here in '72 I know how precious and unique the

25

old-growth forests in the Pacific Northwest are, and I
was very saddened to see logging of them still happening
on this much land compared to what was there.

And to me the Northwest Forest Plan -- I got involved with it as a citizen in an advisory thing they had to do. I was reassured that at least that would help.

So to find out that there's two new plans that reduce the amount of old growth that's going to be put aside, not just for the spotted owl but for everything, we don't even know some of the stuff that's in those lands. There's so few lands that we...

I just urge you to have the moral courage -you know, I mean, slavery was profitable and it stopped.
We have to protect the old growth. It's the same kind
of principle. There are other ways to do it than
logging old growth.

And so I really urge you and I thank you for -- I mean, the timber folks are good guys, the BLM folks are good guys, but there's a lot of pressure. You know that. And we've heard -- we know there's other ways to get what we have.

And the other piece I was saddened about was to see old growth logged for such cheap, cheap prices. That's the public lands logged to private folks

were just -- I couldn't believe the amounts of money.

It's just so so wasteful that we're still doing that

now. We've got this priceless, priceless resource that

we need to keep. We just need to keep it.

There's good scientists out there that say salvage logging has no ecological benefit, and we almost know where the spotted owls hunt. They don't always live where they hunt. So to say that they live here, we don't always know where the land they use.

But I have seen logging where I live where there was an owl -- spotted owl pair. They logged it because the nest was not in the logging, and the owl is not there anymore. So I know firsthand how logging not in where they actually live can actually hurt. That pair is gone.

So thank you for your time.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you, Miss Moffat.

Paul Netter.

MR. METTER: My name is Paul Netter. It's Paul, the way it's spelled, Netter, N-e-t-t-e-r, and I'm here representing myself.

Basically the first problem I see with this is it bothers me a lot that the recovery team is supposed to be an advisory committee to other agencies like the BLM and the Forest Service, and the recovery

team is seeking input and insight from them on how to manage an endangered species.

Those bodies are not supposed to be having input this early in the process. And it bothers me a little bit that the results will inform the way they're able to manage their lands and they're informing the way they're supposed to manage. That is one of my biggest concerns aside from the spotted owl and habitat preservation.

Secondly, I'd like to point out, as everybody else has already pointed out, that 7.7 million acres is 27 percent smaller than the Northwest Forest Plan designated habitat.

It seems like with the additional stress that's put on the spotted owl between the barred owl, global warming, and the other species that have to be confined to a smaller amount of forest that there should be more land over the Northwest Forest Plan designated area. There should be perhaps 10 percent or 50 percent or some percentage more than what was already designated, not less.

And this is partially because the spotted owl is an indicator species for the wildlife and forest health. And if the spotted owl is doing poorly, it's a very good indication that the health of the forest is

not so -- it's not well either.

And if this is because of some animal like the barred owl stealing its habitat, perhaps there needs to be additional indicator species to deal with it to help the forest on.

It's a red herring to say that the causes that are leading to the decline of the spotted owl are not related to the way the forest is managed.

I believe it's also a red herring to say that we can manage the forest for production of timber and that can be done at the same time as protecting habitat.

It's not the purpose of the United States

Fish and Wildlife Service to worry about the management.

It's their job to worry about the endangered species.

They should say absolutely what needs to be done for the spotted owl and not worry about what the BLM, Forest Service, and the two private timber companies have at stake here.

That's part of why we appoint agencies like that instead of electing them, because they're not supposed to need to be accountable to the private interests that are now allegedly supporting you guys.

And I appreciate this time for comments, for what it will do.

Thank you, Mr. Netter. 1 MR. RUESINK: 2 Judith Osborn. MS. OSBORN: My name is Judith Osborn, 3 I'm the executive director of the Umpqua 4 O-s-b-o-r-n. Watersheds. 5 Neither of the two options offered in the 6 7 recovery plan increases protection for the owl. 8 spite of continuing decreasing numbers owls are 9 surviving and reproducing better on federal lands managed under the Northwest Forest Plan than on 10 11 nonfederal lands where logging is much greater. 12 The annual rate the owl population declined on nonfederal lands was more than twice that on federal 13 14 Clearly we need more of the reserve strategy of lands. 15 the Northwest Forest Plan, not less. That is not 16 provided under either option of this bill. 17 The fate of the owls is intimately tied to 18 the fate of our old-growth forests. We have here in 19 Douglas County a unique, immensely rich, and 20 irreplaceable forest, or at least we have the remnants 21 of what we once had. 22 And we will have even less of this 23 awe-inspiring resource if we allow either of these 24 options of this plan to become effective.

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC 1-800-237-DEPO

Our old-growth forests endow us with water

25

so clean and fresh that people come from all over the world to fish in our watershed, to hike these trails, and to breath the air purified by the trees.

The fate of the forest is intimately tied to our human life. We can have jobs and the old growth.

There is decades of work to be done in our plantations.

We need to thin the overstocked, fire-prone managed forests.

We need to make the right decisions now. It is up to us to do all in our power to protect the old-growth habitat, and neither of these options do that. So I hope that you will reconsider and make a better decision because we only have one chance.

Thank you.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you for your comments. Doug Heiken.

MR. HEIKEN: My name is Doug Heiken. The last name is spelled H-e-i-k-e-n. I'm here representing Oregon Wild.

And I'd like to start by saying that I wish that the Washington, DC, oversight committee was here listening. That's the committee that Lynn Scarlet is the chairperson of but she can't even remember the other people who are on the committee, and they seem to have a very strong influence on what's going on here, but yet

we don't even know who they are, how to reach them, and how to influence them, and that's pretty frustrating for the public. They'd get an earful if they were here.

I'd also encourage you to build a fire wall between Fish and Wildlife Service and BLM, both in the same department under the secretary of interior. But the regulator and the regulative agency should not be in such close ties to each other in this stage of the process.

BLM clearly has an agenda and Fish and Wildlife Service has a different agenda, which is to protect the species, not to increase logging on our public lands.

I was recently at a meeting in Wenatchee,
Washington, where a Fish and Wildlife Service official
said the spotted owl is declining so rapidly in
Washington state that we have to look beyond the
reserves and we have to protect all the spotted owl even
in the matrix in order to stop the precipitous decline
of this bird.

To me that says we need another option that we don't even see here in the two that are in this recovery plan. We need to protect all the old-growth habitat and we need to restore a lot of what's been lost due to clear-cutting.

I think the recovery team should take a stand and oppose the BLM's western Oregon plan revision process which would pull the plug -- or pull the rug out from under the Northwest Forest Plan, which is an integrated plan and requires the participation of both the Forest Service and the BLM in order to function.

If we let BLM increase logging like they want to, they will basically limit the ability of owls to disperse between the Cascades and the Coast Range and the Klamath Mountains which will isolate the owls in these natural forestlands and dramatically increase the risk of extinction for the spotted owl.

This Bush plan also deemphasizes the role of habitat, which I think is irresponsible and misleading.

The plan complains that the Northwest Forest Plan reserves can't stop the barred owl from invading, which is only half the truth.

The real truth is that providing more and larger habitat reserves provides the best hope that the barred owl and the spotted owl can eventually coexist together in our old-growth forest.

The recovery plan should expand the reserves, not shrink them, especially when they're facing increased threats from the barred owl, climate change, fires, and so on.

Nonfederal landowners are not contributing to the recovery of the owl like they were assumed to when the interagency scientific committee was drafting their plan.

So we either need to beef up the Forest Practices Act, which is not likely, or we need to dramatically increase the protection on federal lands to compensate for the fact that nonfederal lands are not pulling their weight.

Finally I want to say that the spotted owl recovery could result in a win-win for people and the spotted owl if the government would simply adopt a plan to protect all the remaining mature old-growth forests and shifting all the logging to thinning the dense young plantations and creating better habitat. We would be restoring the forest while creating some jobs and providing wood as a by-product of that restoration.

Thank you for your time.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you.

Katie Weidman.

MS. WEIDMAN: I'm Katie Weidman,

W-e-i-d-m-a-n.

I'm just surprised that any plan for the recovery of an endangered and threatened species would actually recommend or suggest decreasing critical

habitat species. There's no scientific evidence that logging in suitable habitat for spotted owls would help them in any way, even peer-reviewed scientists, unless it's really influenced by economics.

And there's a lot of evidence that owls prefer a high canopy complex structure and lots of downed wood and snags. And even if they're not living in this habitat now, maybe they should be given an opportunity to expand into the habitat while they're recovering.

And so I made my point.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you for your comments.

Patrick Starnes.

MR. STARNES: Can you see that? My name is Patrick Starnes, S-t-a-r-n-e-s. I'm a cabinetmaker. I live in Lookingglass just west of Roseburg here. I wanted to welcome you to the wonderful Umpqua and picking out a lot of places -- beautiful places in Oregon.

MR. RUESINK: Excuse me. Mr. Starnes, when you refer to the map, if you'll be talking from that, would you describe it for us. And is there a chance you could leave that with us?

MR. STARNES: Yeah. This is your map, and I'll leave that.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you.

MR. STARNES: I'll get into the details of it if you'll give me time. I grew up just up the river, up the South Umpqua behind us here in the little town of Dillard as a kid. My dad worked at the Roseburg Forest Products mill when I was a kid. In the '70s he was laid off because of -- not because of the owl like we are used to the layoffs now, but just because of the history of the timber industry, as you know, is a boom-and-bust industry.

And what a lot of us here -- I don't represent any organization. I work with wood every day as a cabinetmaker, but I'm not -- I live in this environment, so I'm an environmentalist, and so I hope that I can bridge the groups here today and that we can -- that we can have a win-win situation. And that's what I want to talk about.

This is an example of forests here in the Umpqua, Umpqua National Forest. This is an example that's probably common throughout the West Coast up in Washington and northern California. But I also have a larger map of the BLM forest.

What these colors are, are all the old clear-cuts on the Umpqua National Forest. The Umpqua National Forest is a million acres. There's a quarter

million acres of clear-cuts here.

The shaded gray areas are the LSRs, the owl reserves. So I think you've heard it time and time again is that the environmentalists agree that we need to thin these plantations for the spotted owl to hope to get those restored back to old-growth characteristics. It will also protect us from fires in those areas.

These younger smaller forests are a lot more prone to fire than the larger, thick bark, high-limbed trees are.

And I do think that it's cool that you guys have this 30-year vision, because I share this similar vision with this plan and the BLM map as a 30-year plan. Because what our communities need, one of the biggest gripes about the forest plan, besides that the owl is declining, but from the industry's point of view is that we don't have a steady, stable, predictable supply of timber.

And over the next 30 years we can do this thinning and get 100 million board feet just in this community every year, and that's what the industry needs. And this is all the 20 inches or smaller, the smaller forests -- or the smaller logs that most of the mills are retooled for.

And I think this kind of thing is the kind

LINDA CRAGO & ASSOCIATES, LLC 1-800-237-DEPO

of thing that both industry and environmentalists can support and that you need to incorporate it in your recommendations to the Forest Service and the BLM to encourage them to stop the regen harvests of the old growth, more like a moratorium on old growth regeneration, clear-cutting the old growth, until we delist the owl and focus for 30 years on this thinning of this forest here.

Here just in Douglas County on public lands we have 400,000 acres of these federal clear-cuts that we need to work on. That's a lot of work. The guys in the Forest Service tell me they don't even have enough people to catch up on the thinning. I don't know about the BLM, but we have a lot of work to do. It's a win-win situation.

And what's great about this thing today and about what all of us wants is we want to delist the owl, not because we've reduced the habitat or we've farmed them out like we do our salmon, but because we truly have protected their habitat, have restored this habitat.

And I also agree with your plan on the barred. I wish Doug Robertson was here. The counties, the states, and the feds spent millions of dollars fighting the invasive species Portuguese broom, the

French broom in our forests, and other species too.

And we can control an invasive species here that -- and on our place, because I help my uncle manage our 200 acres in Lookingglass. Our neighboring property is an old-growth stand with a known spotted owl site, which now has just been -- the spotted owls have been displaced by the barred owls. You can hear them all the time out at our place. And over in the valley is a homeless female spotted owl.

And from what I understand, the study in California within a week after they removed the barred owls, they had spotted owls return. So I mean, that's pretty telling of your study there.

But I agree with Mr. Mickey that we do need to control the invasive species, we need to have a moratorium on old-growth clear-cutting, we need to advise the Forest Service and the BLM staff that until we can delist the owl we need to spend the next 30 years thinning the forests.

So this map is for your use.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you very much, Mr. Starnes.

Chuck Schnautz.

MR. SCHNAUTZ: Very good, got that right.

My name is Chuck Schnautz. That's S-c-h-n-a-u-t-z. And

I'm with Umpqua Watersheds.

I think many of the speakers before covered most of the subjects that I would speak to, but I would say several things, and one is that while I understand Commissioner Robertson's desire to cut timber because it means dollars for our county, which is important, I think that subject is separate from what we're talking about here today, which is protection of an endangered species.

I think that possibly following up on that, what Mr. Starnes talked about may give a solution where we can continue to protect that species and at the same time produce more board feet of timber in the community.

I don't know about removing the barred owl.

I've just heard about that in the press in the last short period of time.

I do know that removing old growth will decrease the viability of the species. In Option 2 as presented, and I admit that I've only very briefly skimmed through this, but in Option 2 it seems that we're asking forest land managers to manage an endangered species.

And I think that in place of that we need scientists who are in that business to be the ones to decide where we cut timber and where we need to leave

habitat.

And my final point, which is an item that I think is terribly critical to this whole thing, is who monitors the process. I think it's naive to think that land managers, if they're the ones that are monitoring the process, that they're going to have the best interests of the species at heart.

And I think, as Patrick Quinn said earlier, the spotted owl is the canary in the coal mine, and I think how we deal with the spotted owl will say a lot about how we protect other species in the future.

Thank you very much.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you, Mr. Schnautz.

Carole Gale.

MS. GALE: I'm Carole Gale. That's C-a-r-o-l-e G-a-l-e.

I don't have prepared remarks. I have lived on Coos Bay Wagon Road in Lookingglass, and I've been hearing about the difficulties of people living in this area with reduced logging and so on as well as hearing about the loss of habitat and animals and so on, and it all concerns me.

I can't help but think that the old-growth forest takes so long to grow that the invasion of the barred owl is relatively short-term by comparison so

that preserving the old growth, which can take hundreds of years to regenerate itself, cutting that would set us back hundreds of years, and if there's only a tiny bit of old growth left, that it -- there should be a moratorium on cutting it and we should have thinning of younger forests as needed, as has been discussed already.

And I am aware of the logging going on because I hear the logging trucks go by all day long past my house on Coos Bay Wagon Road, and I'm sure some of them are the thinner trees that need thinning, but some of them are huge trees as well.

And I feel that it is the Fish and Wildlife's brief to protect the wildlife. And the timber industry, which has been the backbone of this whole county, is also an important industry, but it certainly seems that what Mr. Starnes said could work where you have jobs in the managed plantations that have smaller diameter trees.

And there -- whatever little bit of old growth there is left, it should not be reduced by a new plan that's called a habitat conservation plan but actually seems to be a reduction of the habitat for the owl.

And the owl is just one of many endangered

1 2

species. And given the global climate changes and the kind of speed with which human changes visit upon nature and whereas nature takes millennia to make changes and human change goes so fast that we can't really see the effects of it, I feel that we really need to give the benefit of the doubt to the -- to the wildlife that's struggling to continue to exist.

And so I would say that I don't support either option on your forest plan that reduces habitat for the old -- for the old growth spotted owl.

And I would just conclude with a quote from Shakespeare from the *Merchant of Venice*. "You take my life when you take the means by which I live." And the habitat is the means by which the owl lives.

Thank you for listening.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you for your comments.

The last speaker that's currently registered to provide comments is Amy Price. If any of the others here in the audience wish to provide comments at this time, I would encourage you to go to the sign-up table and fill out a card and we'll make sure to give you an opportunity to do so.

Go ahead, Miss Price.

MS. PRICE: Thank you for this opportunity to comment. My name is Amy Price. That's A-m-y

P-r-i-c-e. I'm representing myself, but I am a wildlife researcher for Oregon State University, and I have been for over a decade.

Almost everything that I want to say has been covered by the rest of the public here, but I did want to encourage you folks to look to our neighbor to the north and to look at Canada.

I don't know if you know -- you probably do -- Canada and British Columbia only has a handful of spotted owls, and they have recently been encouraged to go out and capture each and every single one to have a captive breeding, which is the only chance that that whole nation in the province of British Columbia has for recovery.

And to look at their mistakes in their forest practices will show what could happen with just the species of the spotted owl. And it's not just the species of the spotted owl that Canada is losing.

There's a myriad of other species that they can't go out and capture and start a captive breeding program.

So Option 1 or Option 2 or any option that we decide on we need to look -- we need to know that we are protecting everything, not just the species that we can look at and we can survey that's a tangible species, and to try and do anything to avoid this, and that would

require saving the habitat, and what everyone here said, saving the old growth, looking at different forest practices, whatever it takes to avoid the extreme thing that's happening to our neighbor in the north.

That boundary that is a line between our two countries isn't -- the spotted owls don't see that and the other species don't see that.

But I just urge you to look deeply into what you can do to make a plan that's viable. And I see a lot of good things in here, but I also see that it needs more.

Thank you very much.

MR. RUESINK: Thank you for your comments.

I have called the names of everyone that had indicated they wished to provide comments this evening. Again, if anyone in the audience wishes to provide comments or a statement, please go to the sign-up desk and we'll give you an opportunity to do so.

If we do not have other speakers, we will go in recess at this time, and I would encourage you to go over to the information room to look at some of the maps and the information available and also to take advantage of the fact that we do have knowledgeable staff from Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service here that will be able to provide you

additional information or answer any questions.

I'm not seeing anyone moving to the sign-up table at this time, so I would like to take a recess, and we will reconvene if we get additional speakers, and the meeting will remain open until 9:30 this evening, the scheduled time for the close.

So we are now in recess and we're off the record.

(WHEREUPON, there was a recess taken.)

MR. RUESINK: Back on. We are on the record. It is now 9:30 p.m. On behalf of the US Fish and Wildlife Service we appreciate the time and effort that all of you took this evening to present your comments. They have been very informative. They will be fully considered in coming to a final decision.

Again, thanks for coming out this evening to give us your comments on the Northern Spotted Owl Recovery Plan. This session is closed. We're off the record.

-000-

STATE	OF	OREGON)												
)	ss.	С	E	R	Т	I	F	I	С	A	Т	E
County	, of	Douglas)												

I, LEANNE LAW, do hereby certify that:

At the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Oregon;

That at said time and place I reported in stenotypy all testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter;

That thereafter my notes were reduced to a computer-aided transcript and that the foregoing transcript consisting of 66 pages is a true and correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of the whole thereof, to the best of my ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 4th day of June 2007, in the City of Roseburg, County of Douglas, State of Oregon.



Leanne Law

Certified Shorthand Reporter Certificate No. 94-0285